

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 24, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 1-28 were pending, and rejected claims 1-28. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24 and 28 have been amended, claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23 and 25 have been canceled and new claims 29 and 30 have been added, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 20-2, 24, and 26-30 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Johnson. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Stierle. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 4, 6, 13, 15, 19, 21, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Stierle and Cunningham. Page 10 of the Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Stierle, Cunningham and Puttre. Page 11 of the Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Stierle, Cunningham, Puttre and Smith. Page 12 of the Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Stierle, Cunningham and Smith.

Johnson discusses a system that allows a user to drag and drop an image found on the Web into a specialized window called a Grabnet window.

Stierle discusses a system that allows a user to insert specifications and CAD symbols from the Internet into their designs.

Cunningham discusses a system that allows drawings in a special DFW format to be posted to a Web page and viewed with a plug-in.

Puttre discusses a system that allows 3D VRML files to be posted to the Web and viewed with a VRML plug-in.

Smith discusses a system that allows multiple users to share designs.

In contrast, the present invention (see claims 1, 3, 10 ,12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 28, 29 and 30) is directed to a system, process or medium by which an image (a CAD part) can be inserted into

a users application (a CAD application). CAD parts have attributes, such as a path to a library containing the part, identification of a reference point for the part, etc. (see figure 6). When the part image is inserted into the application, the URL location for the image, or where it is published along with information about the image, such as the title of the page where the image is available, are used to update the attributes of the part in the CAD application. That is, the URL is made into an attribute of the CAD part and managed as an attribute. The prior art does not teach or suggest this.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/27/04

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501